UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/766,652	01/27/2004	Younger Ahluwalia	03137.000004.	3967	
	7590 02/18/200 CELLA HARPER &	EXAMINER			
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			RUDDOCK, ULA CORINNA		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1794		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/18/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/766,652	AHLUWALIA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Ula C. Ruddock	1794		

	Ola C. Ruddock	1794	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	r).		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter			
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi			appean emiss a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NO		oadoo
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	**		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li></ul>	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all- non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application ir	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.  Other:			
	/Ula C Ruddock/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1794	
	,		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the previously set forth rejections are maintained. Applicant argues that the combination of the cited prior art does not teach or reasonably suggest that the "coating does not bleed through said substrate." Applicant argues that "The Office Action provides no rationale whatsoever as to how the composite materials disclosed in Ahluwalia '257 would need to be modified in order to achieve a new composite material which includes the admittedly lacking elements of Claim 1 and a coating that does not bleed through the substrate. Nor does the Office Action provide any rationale as to how the composite materials disclosed in Ahluwalia '257 could be modified to include the admittedly lacking elements of Claim 1 while maintaining a coating with essentially the same ionic charge as the substrate it coats and that does not bleed through the substrate. In addition, the Office Action fails to account for the leap of logic as to how characteristics of the Ahluwalia '257 composite materials will also exist in the Office Action's proposed composite material, especially when the Office Action fails to provide any level of specificity as to the specific structure and composition of the proposed composite material." This argument is not persuasive because Ahluwalia '257 does not suggest that the addition of clay would result in a coating that bleeds through the substrate. One having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the addition of clay improves the fire resistance of a material. Applicant also argues that the aluminum sheet provides unexpected results. This argument is not persuasive because it has been held that the evidence relied \*>upon< should establish "that the differences in results are in fact unexpected and unobvious and of both statistical and practical significance." Ex parte Gelles, 22 USPQ2d 1318, 1319. Applicant has not established this by referring to paragraphs 49 and 50 of the present specification. The test results in these paragraphs do not fairly compare the combination of Ahluwalia, Langer, GB '260, Dugan, or Dombeck to that of the present invention. Therefore, the rejection is proper and maintained.